



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/503,042	02/11/2000	Albert D. Baker	Baker 21-4	6042

7590 01/12/2005

Joseph B. Ryan
Ryan & Mason, L.L.P.
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560

EXAMINER

LY, ANH VU H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2667

DATE MAILED: 01/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/503,042

Applicant(s)

BAKER ET AL.

Examiner

Anh-Vu H Ly

Art Unit

2667

– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 September 2004.
2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 11-13 and 24-26 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10, 14-23 and 27 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

1. Claims 1, 3-4, 7-10, 14, 16-17, 20-23, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Araujo et al (US Patent No. 6,108,350).

With respect to claims 1, 14, and 27 Araujo discloses (see Abstract and Figs. 1A-B) a method for improved configuration of a link (a method for use in configuring a device coupled to a communication network) between CPE and an intermediate device in a network. Wherein, as illustrated in Figs. 1A-B, Araujo discloses a link configuration between an end station and an intermediate device (gateway or central office). Herein, the local network can be assumed as either between the CPE and the central office or between the central office and the backbone network and the external network can be either the central office and the backbone network or the central office and the CPE. Therefore, as considered by the examiner, the local network is

Art Unit: 2667

the network including the central office and the backbone network, while the external network includes the central office and the CPE. And since the link determination is between the CPE and the central office therefore it is external to the local network (the communication link being external to the local network and comprising a communication link of the one or more additional networks).

Araujo discloses (col. 7, lines 5-12) that the automatic stack determination module 136 of the central office (considered as a first device by examiner) sends a transmission to customer premise equipment 110 (considered as at least one additional device by examiner). By observing the response to the transmission and determining in which protocol the response is formatted, the automatic stack determination module 136 detects the protocol used by the customer premise equipment 110 (automatically determining a link type associated with a communication link between a first device and at least one additional device coupled to the communication network by transmitting one or more messages from the first device and examining a corresponding response received by the first device over the communication link).

Further, as shown in Fig. 1A, the initial selection 152 is changed to an efficient selection 151 for the CPE 110 and efficient selection 153 is used by the central office 130 since the backbone network is an ATM network (configuring at least one of the first and additional devices in accordance with the determined link type). Herein, the central office (first device) comprises an Access MUX 135 (considered as a gateway by examiner) for connecting the CPE 110 to the network 137 (wherein the first device comprising a gateway coupled between the local network and one or more additional networks). Further, as shown in Figs. 1A-B, the automatic

Art Unit: 2667

stack detection 136 of the central office 130 detecting the protocol used by the CPE 110 (wherein step of automatically determining a link type is implemented at least in part within the gateway).

With respect to claims 3 and 16, Araujo discloses in Fig. 1A, the central office 130 comprising an automatic stack detection 136, herein, module 136 is considered as a computer server by the examiner (first device comprising a network server).

With respect to claims 4 and 17, Araujo discloses in Figs. 1A-B, the link is connected to either ATM network or Frame Relay network 137 (determined link type is one of a plurality of link variants associated with the communications network).

With respect to claims 7 and 20, Araujo discloses (col. 6, lines 33-37) that additional protocol layers are included in a complete stack defining the protocols used in the transmission, but are not shown in Fig. 1A. For example, an IP protocol layer would typically be used for internet communication (communications network comprising an IP network) above the PPP layer.

With respect to claims 8 and 21, Araujo discloses in Fig. 1A, the network including the ATM network 137, herein, it is known ATM network comprising different encapsulation layers (wherein the determined link type comprising one of a plurality of link variants at least a subset of which corresponds to encapsulation of different types of protocols in ATM cells).

With respect to claims 9 and 22, Araujo discloses in Fig. 1A, the network including the ATM network 137. Therefore, data are transmitted via virtual circuit/virtual path (communication link comprising an ATM VC).

With respect to claims 10 and 23, Araujo discloses in Fig. 1A, the protocol stack including PPP, ATM, ADSL, etc...(wherein determined link type comprising one of a plurality of link variants including one or more of a LLC, PPP, LLC-PPP, IP, and LLC-IP protocol, Ethernet, and LLC-Ethernet protocol).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2, 5, 6, 15, 18, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Araujo et al (US Patent No. 6,108,350) in view of Abler et al (US Pub No. 2003/0067884 A1).

With respect to claims 2 and 15, Araujo discloses in Figs. 1A-B, protocol detection mechanism is implemented by the central office (first device). Araujo does not disclose the first device comprising CPE. In other words, Araujo does not disclose that the protocol detection mechanism is implemented by the CPE. Abler discloses in Fig. 2, a multi-protocol network wherein workstations 205 (CPE) are self-determined and configured to the detected protocol.

Art Unit: 2667

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement protocol detection mechanism by CPE in Araujo's system, as suggested by Abler, to detect protocol used in the network.

With respect to claims 5-6 and 18-19, Araujo discloses in Fig. 1, the CPE 110 is connected to the central office via ADSL modem 112 (CPE is coupled to communication network via a DSL and ADSL termination unit-receive device).

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claims 11-13 and 24-26 are allowable.

The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance:

The prior art does not teach or fairly suggest wherein the determining steps including first testing to determine if the link is an LLC type link, performing at least one additional test of a first type if the link is not an LLC type link, and performing at least one additional test of a second type if the link is an LLC type link, as specified in independent claims 11 and 24.

Conclusion


4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Anh-Vu H Ly whose telephone number is 571-272-3175. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:00am - 4:00pm.

Art Unit: 2667

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chi Pham can be reached on 571-272-3179. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

avl


CHI PHAM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600 1/7/05